





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



From the Author

CHURCH EDUCATION.

THE PRESENT STATE

OF THE

MANAGEMENT CLAUSE QUESTION,

WITH A

PROPOSAL FOR MEETING AND COUNTERACTING

THE EVIL EFFECTS AND TENDENCIES OF THE SYSTEM OF THE

COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,

BY

THE ESTABLISHMENT

OF A

CHURCH EDUCATION FUND.

BY

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A.

VICAR OF EAST BRENT, SOMERSET,

AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1849.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

CHURCH EDUCATION,

&c.

THE present state of the Management Clause question is set forth in the following Statement and Appeal, published June 25th, 1849, and submitted respectfully to Members of both Houses of Parliament :—

Statement and Appeal submitted respectfully to Members of both Houses of Parliament.

The controversy between the National Society, with other Members of the Church of England, and the Committee of Council on Education, in respect of the Management Clauses, is now narrowed to a single point.

That point, as it has been, from the first, *the one real point at issue*, so, under the present aspect of the question, does it appear to call for very exact statement.

The case, then, stands thus—

On one side is a large class of Church Schools—the Class which places the control and management of the School in the hands of the clergyman of the parish, with appeal to the Bishop—a class of Schools, not simply consistent with the order and practice of the Church, but, *above any other*, sanctioned and commended by the order and practice of the Church.

The constitution and administration of this class of Church Schools involves principles which great numbers of Churchmen, Laity and Clergy, *hold sacred*.

On the other hand, the rule of the Committee of Council on Education, which requires, as a condition of State assistance towards the founding of Schools, that one or other of the Management Clauses be adopted, *excludes absolutely the founders of this large class of Church Schools from a share in the Education Grant*.

This rule—under whatever aspect it is regarded—appears to be altogether indefensible.

1. It is directly opposed to the principle upon which Parliament has voted the Education Grant, viz. that of assisting the Church of England and the other religious bodies existing in this country, to do their own work in their own way.
2. It denies equal justice to Churchmen, as contrasted with other religious bodies existing in this country.
3. It gives to one Churchman what it refuses to another, though both *alike* found their Schools on a legal basis, and both are *alike* willing to admit the Government Inspection, as agreed upon in 1840.
4. It contravenes the first principles of civil and religious liberty.
5. It is full of hindrance and injury to the cause of the education of the people.

These are the naked facts of the case.

Is it just—is it reasonable—is it honourable—is it for the public good—that the Committee of Council should thus act upon the necessities of Churchmen, and their earnest desire to promote education; should thus in part tempt, and in part coerce them, under a heavy penalty, to substitute for that constitution and administration of their Schools which, in their judgment, is most consistent with, and most sanctioned and commended by, the order and the practice of the Church, another form and manner of constitution and administration, which, whether they regard it in itself, or in what appear to them to be its certain consequences, they cannot approve?

The appeal now lies to Parliament; it is not easy to overstate

what depends upon the decision ; but we have every hope that the decision will be such as to restore that confidence which the course of the Committee of Council has, so needlessly, impaired. We cannot believe that Parliament will be prepared to sanction the enforcement of an unjust rule : we have far too great and high a trust in that sense of justice which governs the decisions of Parliament, to think that the Church of England will have to reproach the State of England with grievous and causeless wrong.

(Signed)

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

East Brent, Somerset,

June 25th, 1849.

It has been a great point gained that the question between the Church of England and the Committee of Council on Education, in respect of the Management Clauses, can now be placed before the public in this concise and intelligible shape, stripped of all that ambiguity which belongs of necessity to an endless complication of details, and a variety of statements and counter statements, rejoinders, and replications. If no other advantage had as yet resulted from two years' discussion—which is very far, indeed, from being the case—this would, of itself, be matter of great congratulation. It is always most important that what may be called the “accidents” of a controversy should be set altogether aside, and the great principle of the controversy brought prominently forward, in the simplest and most unencumbered form.

It is this, then, that has been gained by the discussion and by the almost unanimous decision of June 6th ; but, while it would be difficult to over-estimate the amount of the advantage which

has thus accrued to the cause of Church Education, it must not be forgotten that there is a great deal yet to be secured: it would be a very fatal mistake, indeed, if Churchmen were to allow the consciousness of partial success, and their love of peace, to move them to relax those efforts which have been so well begun—there can be no real peace so long as principles are either *half-maintained* or *half-respected*; and the last is the sure consequence of the first; it is one thing to make remonstrances and protests, to deliver speeches and to pass resolutions; it is quite another thing to *act*, and, if need be, to *incur difficulty* and to *suffer loss* in the cause of Church Education.

From the beginning of this controversy we have had three things principally in view: 1st. That the Annual Meeting of the National Society should declare itself definitely and unmistakeably upon the question at issue between the Church of England and the Committee of Council on Education, in respect of the Management Clauses. 2nd. That the Committee of the National Society should make common cause with the body of the Society. 3rd. That their joint representations should prevail upon Parliament to do justice to the founders of Church Schools. The first of these things has been secured; the second and third remain still in doubt; the second indeed only *partially* in doubt, for it is well known that there are many Members of the Committee who are entirely of the same mind with ourselves. It is, however, the partial doubt which hangs about the

second; it is this, and *this only*, which makes us apprehensive of the result in Parliament.

In looking back upon the history of this question, it is very remarkable to observe the gradual process by which men's minds, especially of late, have become alive to the necessity of dealing with the question in its simplest form. Of this, the discussion of June 6th supplied most conclusive evidence. The mind of the meeting was made up to refuse so much as to entertain the consideration of details, so long as Church founders were denied the most entire liberty to constitute and administer their Schools as they might severally judge to be most in accordance with the order and the practice of the Church. It was felt that the real point in dispute was simply this,—Shall the Church of England declare what is to be the future constitution and management of Church Schools, or shall the Committee of Council on Education declare it? It was felt, too, that this was no mere question of etiquette, no contest for an empty precedence, no struggle for an abstraction; but that it was a question of the maintenance, or of the surrender, of principles which large numbers of Churchmen, Laity and Clergy, *hold sacred*.

With this view of the entire question,—the only just and true view of it,—to have entered at all into any consideration of the details of Management Clauses, which can in no sense be said to have been either framed or adopted by the Church, would have been to concede the very point in dispute. *To discuss the details of these Clauses implies and assumes*

that the Clauses, as a whole, in one shape or another, are to be imposed upon the founders of Church Schools ; whereas, the real question is a preliminary one, viz. whether they shall be imposed or not. It has, indeed, been the one grand mistake throughout the whole of this most untoward business that the existence of the Clauses should have been so much as recognized on the part of the Church, without its having been laid down, on the part of the Church, as an indispensable preliminary condition, and assented to as such on the part of the State, that no manner of prejudice should accrue under their operation, to the full and entire liberty of Church founders. Members of the National Society feel very strongly that this condition of co-operation with the State ought not simply to have been *claimed*, but to have been *insisted upon* in the outset ; and that, at any period of the negotiation, so soon as there was the slightest symptom of a departure from this basis on the part of the Committee of Council, all negotiation ought to have ceased at once.

It has been most unfortunate that this course has not been taken by the Committee of the National Society ; if it had been taken, by far the greater part of the many, and complicated, and grievous embarrassments, which now beset the Society, would have been avoided altogether : in place of division, there would have been but one expression of opinion ; in place of distrust, unreserved confidence ; in place of weakness, a strong and united front ; in place of exhausted resources, a full exchequer ; and the

general result, out of doors, would have been that the Committee of Council would long ago have been disabled from doing what they are doing now, *i. e.* trampling upon the rights of conscience, and the first principles of civil and religious liberty in the case of the Church of England.

If it is said that this is a censure upon the Committee of the National Society, and that such censure is not seemly; I answer, that it is no censure. Censure applies, as I have always understood it, to motives, and intentions, and principles; and God forbid that I should be supposed for one instant to cast suspicion upon these! I deal simply, as all members of the Society have a plain right to do, with the *acts* of Committee; and I say, that, high as is the duty which every Churchman owes to the Committee, it is very possible that circumstances may arise, under which the collective action of the Committee may have become such as to force upon Churchmen that they have one higher duty still. Every Clergyman and every Layman of the Church of England is charged with the maintenance of the Faith; nor has there ever been a time in the history of the Church when there has existed a more pressing necessity upon each and all of us, to exert ourselves in word and deed, that the Faith may be handed down to our children, even as we have received it.

Now one principal means of maintaining the Faith, is the care of Church Education; and if it is forced upon Churchmen, as it has been upon myself, that the proceedings of the Committee of the

Society in respect of the Management Clauses have been such as to compromise the cause of Church Education, they cannot, because they dare not, fold their hands and hold their peace. To expostulate, and, with all respect, to point out mistakes; to disallow decisions even, if it shall be necessary to do so; all these are, as it seems to me, parts of that duty which members of the National Society owe to the Committee itself in so grave a case, as they are unquestionably parts of that duty which they owe to the Church, and to Him who is the Great Head of the Church. Legitimate expression of opinion, upon one of the weightiest matters with which a Churchman can be concerned, is not censure of the Committee of the National Society. It has unhappily been the case in the present instance, that the Committee, as a body, have taken one view, and the great majority of the members of the Society have taken another; but I have never understood that the difference amounted to a difference of principle, but simply to this, — whether certain things should be *insisted upon*, as indispensable conditions of the recommendation of certain Management Clauses by the National Society; or whether the Society should be content with a less measure of resistance, — with remonstrance and with protest. Now I confess, that it appears to me, that if protests and remonstrances against a course of action, as being unjust to Church founders, and dangerous to the cause of Church Education, are to end simply in accepting, and submitting to, the exact

things which have been the subjects both of protest and remonstrance, it is a mere waste of time and sign of weakness to make any protest or remonstrance at all : once made and disregarded, they should, I think, have been followed up by clear and decided action. There is such a thing as *an ultimatum* in a negotiation between two parties whose final views and objects are opposed, and who can only co-operate so far as neither intrude upon the other's province. Now if the Church of England were to seek, under the existing religious and social circumstances of this country, to interfere with the free action of the State, in assisting other religious bodies to educate their children, *that* would be an intrusion into the province of the State on the part of the Church ; on the other hand, that the State should seek to interfere, in any degree, with the internal constitution and administration of Church Schools, is an intrusion into the province of the Church on the part of the State : the only difference between the two cases is, that, as a fact, the Committee of Council, professing to represent the State, has been guilty of the intrusion, and that the Church has not.

With these few words I leave, as I trust for ever, all that has been said about censuring the Committee of the National Society.

And here too I leave, as I trust for ever, the Management Clause question. If the existing Clauses are to remain as part of the arrangement, that is, if, under any circumstances, they are to be so much as *recommended* to founders of Schools by the National

Society, I hope, for the sake of those who may be content to adopt them, that they will be made to have at least something of a Church character; *which now they have not*. There is still no provision in the Clauses,

1. That no person shall be capable of becoming, or continuing, a member of the Managing Committee of a Church School who is a joined member of any other religious denomination, or a frequenter of any place of religious worship besides the Church.
2. The power of appointment and dismissal of the schoolmaster, schoolmistress, and assistant teachers, is still withheld from the Clergyman; and so long as this is so, it is surely quite idle to say that the Clergyman has "*the moral and religious superintendence of the School*," as claimed for him by the Committee of the National Society; or even of "*the moral and religious instruction of all the scholars attending the School*," as "conceded" by the Committee of Council.
3. The appeal to the Bishop upon all points is still denied.

It is then the simple truth that the Clauses have as yet *no Church character*. If then, I say, they are to remain as part of the arrangement, I hope they will, for the sake of those who may be content to adopt them, have this character stamped upon them, at least to some extent.

This is my hope. What I call upon Churchmen to claim and to insist upon, *at whatever cost*,

and in the face of whatever consequences, is this—that those who do not approve of any one of the Clauses, however modified, may be left altogether free to constitute and administer their Schools otherwise than is provided in the Clauses, without prejudice to their claim for a share in the Education Grant. And so highly do I estimate the value and importance of this claim, that I will here state unreservedly, that, while I would do every thing I may do to uphold and to assist the National Society, I would rather that the National Society should cease to exist, than that the claim should be surrendered, or, even to the smallest extent, compromised. Now, these are words which no Churchman could write, if his convictions were not very deep. I do not hesitate to write them. I do not doubt at all that to acquiesce in the claim of the Committee of Council in respect of the Management Clauses, will work very great and lasting injury to Church Education. It is nothing to me in what manner these Clauses have been, or may be, *modified*. I believe that their principle is vicious,—the principle of entrusting the effective control of a Church School to a Committee of Management, however such Committee may be composed, instead of to the parish Clergyman,—and that, so long as this principle is retained, these Clauses cannot be made *safe* by any process. Others may regard them differently, but this is my view of them. If then the National Society shall ultimately acquiesce in the claim of the Committee of Council, and I must choose between

the Society and Church Education, my choice is made at once. In my judgment, there is no ground upon which the National Society can even *recommend* the Clauses as they now stand; and, to go beyond this, and to allow the claim of the Committee of Council, that they should be established as *the rule* for the constitution and administration of Church Schools, with the sanction of the Society, this is, I think, what very few members of the Society are prepared to admit. There was some discussion at the Annual Meeting as to what that is which makes a School to be, properly speaking, “a Church School.” I beg leave to say that nothing I heard then, or have heard or read elsewhere upon this point, has, in the smallest degree, altered, or modified, my judgment upon it, as expressed in pp. 16—18 of my letter to the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Meantime, the Church is placed at a great disadvantage from this protracted controversy. A two-fold action is going on against Church Education, backed by all the weight of office, and money, and influence, and authority. It must be met promptly and vigorously. There is no time to be lost. We have great need to make great exertions. Numbers of those who desire to found Church Schools have been, for more than two years, in this precise position,—either they have been tempted by their necessities, and by their earnest desire to promote education, to adopt for their Schools a constitution which they cannot approve, and have yielded to the tempta-

tion,—or they have resisted the temptation, but, in consequence, have been disabled from founding their Schools at all. Here and there parties have supplied the deficiency from their own resources; but such cases cannot be many; and, whether many or few, all that can be said of them is this,—that they are standing examples of the injustice of a State authority.

It will be a great reproach to the Church of England if this state of things is allowed to continue. If it shall continue, we must be almost driven to suppose that Church Education does not lie very near the hearts of Churchmen; that we are ready enough to protest and to remonstrate, but not to make sacrifices, or to suffer loss; and yet, it is scarce possible to believe, in the face of facts, that this is the true account of English Churchmen; and there will, I am persuaded, be an abundant readiness to meet a new call upon their self-denial in the same spirit in which they are enabled, from day to day, to meet other calls of a like character for the glory of God and the good of His Church.

It has been stated publicly, that, out of some 18,000 Church Schools, 2000 or upwards are already, more or less, under the control or influence of the Committee of Council. Now, when we consider that this is the result of the operations of less than three years—for we must date the real power of the Committee of Council from the promulgation of the Minutes of 1846—the statement is not a little alarming; and it would seem that something more

than negotiation, and protest, and remonstrance, is required to meet the evil.

The proposition, then, which I have to make is this:—That in the event of an unfavourable issue in Parliament, or of any delay¹ in the decision of Parliament, on the ground that negotiations are still in progress, or upon any other ground, there be established, without further loss of time, a CHURCH EDUCATION FUND, to be applied in aid of all those founders of Church Schools who are shut out from State assistance by the arbitrary rule of the Committee of Council, and for other uses, which I will presently specify. The details of such a fund need be few and simple. The Committee of the National Society would not, as I trust, refuse to take charge of it, and of its administration. I may be allowed, for the present, simply to suggest the *absolute necessity* of such a fund, if Church Education is to be saved from the combined action of mine and battery: for it will, I think, appear, as we go on, that, unless the principle of a Church Education Fund is at once adopted, and unless it can be so carried out, without loss of time, as to place the founders of Church Schools in the same position of

¹ It has, within the last few days, been decided, upon the best advice, that at this late period of the Session, it is not advisable to press the question upon the notice of Parliament. But Churchmen may be assured that no time will be lost in bringing it forward very early next year, unless Government shall, meantime, do full and ample justice to the claims of the Church of England; and even in this case, it will be, further, absolutely necessary that the terms and conditions of State assistance should be ascertained and settled by Act of Parliament.

advantage in respect of pecuniary assistance with that which they would have occupied if they had conformed to the rule of the Committee of Council, there must be the greatest danger either that Church Schools will be founded very generally upon a vicious principle, or that they will not be founded at all.

Now *the last* of these two results, full of distress and disadvantage to the cause of God's Church as it would be, would yet carry with it by far the least injury of the two; but *the first* is what would generally happen. If the relations between the Church of England and the State of England in respect of Education remain where they are now, one set of founders after another will persuade themselves that they can see sufficient grounds of confidence, in their own particular case, why, after all, no harm to the cause of Church Education may be expected to accrue from their falling in with the terms of the Committee of Council. I am afraid that all who will reason thus—and I am very sorry to think that many, in their anxious desire to found Schools, or to increase their efficiency, must have so reasoned already—will leave out of their calculation *two things*, both of which ought to be most carefully taken into account: one, that it is the essence of such influence as that coveted by the Committee of Council to begin with small beginnings, and to grow and increase from year to year: so that what seems insignificant now, and not worth considering, or, at any rate, such as may be easily met and counteracted by more wholesome influences, may, very probably, five years hence,

be overwhelming. The experience of the last three years has established this probability beyond dispute; and there is no single feature of the case which has had more power to open the eyes of Churchmen to their true position in respect of the Committee of Council: but, nevertheless, each set of founders will be sorely tempted to persuade themselves that their own particular case will form a special exception. The other thing in danger of being forgotten, is this, that Churchmen are bound not to consider their own case simply,—even supposing that it could be shown that *here* there was, and could be, no danger,—but also the effect which their course of action and their example will have upon other members of the Body of Christ. Now, every single case of union and co-operation with the Committee of Council becomes one more proof of general confidence; for, whether it is *really* such or not, it is certain that it will be so quoted, and so understood; and no man can say that it is not very reasonable, that it should be so quoted and so understood. *Churchmen cannot, at least as it seems to me, declare that they distrust the Committee of Council, and, at the same time, comply with the terms of the Committee of Council, and take their money, consistently with the duty which they owe to themselves and to the Church.*

Now, it would appear to be the province of the Church, in her collective capacity, to interpose between her members and the hardships and temptations to which they are thus subjected by

the rule of the Committee of Council. The first ground, then, for the *immediate* establishment of a CHURCH EDUCATION FUND is to be found in the present position of Church founders in relation to the Committee of Council on Education.

Another ground is, that the Church may be enabled to establish, without further loss of time, an efficient, and, so far as is practicable, an uniform, system of Diocesan Inspection.

And at this point I would beg to call the attention of Churchmen to this consideration; that, supposing the issue of the Management Clause controversy to be satisfactory², and to give us all the security we desire in respect of the future constitution and administration of Church Schools, so that, as far as the *founders* of such Schools are concerned, the necessity for a Church Education Fund would no longer exist; it will still be *altogether necessary* to establish such a fund in connexion with the second point, *viz.* Diocesan Inspection, to enable Churchmen to meet and counteract the great and growing evils with which they are threatened under the operation of the Minutes of 1846. And I would beg further to observe, that in this point of view my

² Under the most favourable aspect of the case, it is now, however, to be expected that some time will elapse before justice is done, and as Church founders and the cause of Church Education are, meantime, suffering every day under the operation of the rule of the Committee of Council, it would appear to be very necessary that the Church Education Fund should be established *at once*, as well for the sake of the *founders*, as for the sake of the *supporters* of Schools.

proposal involves no collision with a State authority, as has *necessarily* been the case in respect of the Management Clause controversy: *there* the complaint of the Church of England has been, that she has been dealt with unequally and unjustly, and she has demanded redress of a palpable grievance at the hands of Parliament. But if that portion of the Education Grant which is applied to the purposes of annual assistance be dispensed alike to all promoters of Schools, whether Churchmen or otherwise, on exactly the same terms, and with the same entire dependence upon the will and pleasure of the Committee of Council, and Churchmen feel that *they at least* cannot accept the "advantages" offered to them under such conditions, consistently with a due regard for the security of Church teaching and Church discipline, but that the practical effect of such acceptance must be to compromise the office and the position of the parish Clergyman, there is obviously nothing in *this* case for Churchmen to do but to supply the deficiency out of their own independent resources. So long as a system is *the same to all alike*, there is no ground for an appeal to Parliament, because there is, properly speaking, *no grievance*; though it may be very true that the system is, in its collective aspect, and as applied to all, both unwise and unjust. In such a case, it can be nothing but the continued efforts of *all* that will prevail to set it aside.

Now, it may be, after all, that a Church Education Fund will be imperatively called for, both for the

sake of *founders* and for the sake of *supporters* of Church Schools ; but I cannot see any present prospect of a state of things which will dispense with the obligation to establish it in connexion with the proposed system of Diocesan Inspection, whatever may be the issue in respect of the Management Clauses.

The great desirableness, not to say necessity, of a system of Diocesan Inspection is fully recognized in the Resolutions passed at the "annual meeting of secretaries," June 5th, 1849³. But it is to be observed that the second of these Resolutions declares that "such Inspection is not to be considered as interfering with, or in lieu of, the Inspection appointed by the Committee of Council on Education⁴." Now it is not very clear what this means. If it means that Diocesan Inspection is not to supersede the *act* of Government Inspection, there is, I suppose, no danger of *that*. But if it means that Diocesan Inspection is not to seek to counteract and supersede the influence of Government Inspection as it operates *now*, and as it must continue to operate under the Minutes of 1846, I beg leave to say that it is precisely because it is *most to be desired* that Diocesan Inspection *should* counteract and supersede the influence of Government Inspection, that a great

³ See Appendix A.

⁴ This appears not to be a sufficiently careful statement of the character of the appointment of the Government Inspectors for Church of England Schools. The Committee of Council has only a *partial* and *concurrent* authority in that appointment.

effort ought now to be made to establish it as an efficient system. Indeed, if it is not to have this effect, it is not easy to see why it should be established at all.

The whole question of Government Inspection has now become so intimately connected with that of annual assistance in various shapes under the operation of the Minutes of 1846, that it seems most convenient to treat of them together.

It was foreseen by some Churchmen in 1839,—I cannot claim to have been one of the number,—that the Government Inspection would, in the end, become the great difficulty between Church and State. The agreement of 1840 was a compromise, and, like all other compromises, it has not had a satisfactory or successful issue. So long, indeed, as there was no question of *annual assistance* to Schools, the Government Inspection was comparatively powerless; it had not room to develope itself. But those who first devised a system under which a new class of *Ἐπίσκοποι* for the Schools of the Church of England was to be called into existence, had no intention that it should continue to be so ineffective an engine of State control. They watched their opportunity, as, indeed, I believe them to have done, most carefully and systematically, during the last forty years; and when they had produced their scheme for providing—and they were careful to do this, too, by instalments, in order to avoid causing alarm by the sudden magnitude of their operations—for providing the funds necessary to maintain Queen's

scholars, and pupil teachers, and stipendiary monitors, to augment the salaries of masters and mistresses, to supply School apparatus and cheap books, and had linked all these advantages,—for advantages they doubtless are, when under due direction and control,—had linked them all closely together, and bound them up with Government Inspection, and made them to depend, both for their beginning and for their continuance, upon the Report of the Government Inspector⁵, then indeed they had good ground to congratulate themselves upon having made a very great step toward the ultimate establishment of the State system.

It is for these reasons that I regard the Inspection, as it exists now, in connexion with the Minutes of 1846, as a thing very different indeed from that contemplated and agreed upon in 1840. To the *last* I cannot see any sufficient objection⁶, provided that

⁵ There is a show, it is true, of asking for the opinion of the Clergy and “other managers” of the School, conjointly with that of the Government Inspector; but I do not imagine that any one supposes that the decision really depends upon any opinion but upon that of the Government Inspector himself; or, rather, upon that of the Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education.

⁶ There is, however, very great reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in which the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, by which the Government Inspection was first established, with the concurrence of the Church authorities—has been adhered to in respect of the transmission of the Inspectors’ Reports. I have been compelled, in consequence, to refuse to admit Her Majesty’s Inspector any longer into the East Brent School, feeling that a

in all cases it carry with it the distinct and formal sanction of the Bishop of the diocese. I will allow, however, that it presents considerable difficulties; but with the *first*, I never have had, and I never could have, any thing to do. It wields a power now many hundred-fold greater than it did before; and while I should be very sorry to be considered as reflecting in any degree upon Her Majesty's Inspectors, I hold it to be quite impossible that Churchmen can be too jealously upon their guard against the system which those Inspectors administer; and this the more, because it presents itself in so plausible, and pleasing, and tempting a shape; offering its advantages to all Schools alike, as well to those established prior to the Management Clause controversy, as to those which have come, or shall come, under the compulsory rule of the Committee of Council, in respect to the Management Clauses; and even to those which neither have, nor shall, come under that rule, provided only they consent to admit Government Inspection—*i. e.* Government Inspection *as it now exists*; for I must venture to remind those who, happily for themselves and for the Church, have had nothing to do with a Management Clause—who feel on that account more secure, and are therefore, not unreasonably, less inclined to be suspicious—of the marked and most important differ-

great Church principle is involved in the matter in dispute. It supplies another striking instance of the encroaching policy of the Committee of Council.—See Appendix B.

ence between Government Inspection as it now exists in connexion with the Minutes of 1846, and that *simple* Inspection which was agreed upon in 1840.

The various ways in which the system of Government Inspection, as now extended and armed with greatly-increased powers, operates prejudicially to Church Education, have been frequently and clearly stated; and I have no doubt that it has been a conviction of its true character, and effects, and tendencies, that has stirred men's minds to propose to superadd to it an efficient system of Diocesan Inspection. One of these ways, and, perhaps, that one which has most forced itself upon the attention of Churchmen, is this: that the Government system *compels* the Inspector to devote by far the larger portion of his time and energies to an inquiry into what is commonly called "secular knowledge," as apart from "religious;" and any thing more prejudicial to the true character of a Church School it would, doubtless, be difficult to conceive. So long, however, as this is the character of Government Inspection, I would beg to observe, that simply to superadd to it a system of Diocesan Inspection, as a means of giving more prominence to what, in popular phrase, is termed "religious knowledge," will not meet the mischief at all. The principal result of such an arrangement will be an appearance of rivalry between two systems of Inspection instead of that of one uniform system, directed throughout to one great end, and embracing within its sphere all the subject-

matter of Education, in its due order and subordination. The root of the evil lies in drawing a hard, sharp line between “religious” and “other” instruction—a line which is a very marked feature in all such systems as this with which we are now threatened here in England by the Committee of Council on Education, but which no branch of the Church Catholic acknowledges to exist. When a child has been “made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,” in holy Baptism, the godfathers and godmothers are exhorted by the minister to remember that it is their duty to provide “*chiefly*” that the child may “learn the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and *all other things* which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul’s health.” Here, then, so soon as a child becomes a Christian, religion is made—as it might have been expected it would be made by the care of the Church—the beginning and the end, the sum and substance of all education. Children are to be educated indeed, one with a view to one employment in life, and one with a view to another employment in life; but *all alike* are to be educated, “to do their duty in that station of life unto which God has called them.” God has blended the dogmatic teaching of religious truth with all education; and men must take good heed, if they would not inherit a curse rather than a blessing, how they put these things asunder. Now that the whole tendencies of the Government Inspection,—I am not speaking at all of the aim of the Inspectors—I could

not do them so grievous an injustice—but of the aim and the tendencies of the *system* which they administer,—are to generate in the minds both of teacher and scholar the practical conviction that such separation does not only exist as a matter of fact, which is unhappily true enough, but that it *ought to exist*—is, I think, plainly impossible to be denied.

However, these things have been already stated elsewhere, and the case is beginning to be pretty well understood; it is not necessary, therefore, for me to go into it now in any detail. I am clearly entitled to assume that the danger exists. A very little consideration indeed will serve to show that it is inseparable from the nature of the case.

Now will a system of Diocesan Inspection *meet* the danger? I answer that it will; *but only upon the following conditions.* 1st, *That the Church supply the means of paying the Diocesan Inspectors liberally, so that they too may be able to devote all their time to the work.* 2nd, *That the Church supply the means of offering to Church Schools, through the Diocesan Inspector, the same advantages that are offered by the Committee of Council, through the Government Inspector.* Unless Diocesan Inspection shall be effectually enabled to take this high, and responsible, and commanding position — a position very different indeed from that which it has hitherto occupied, I have no belief that the system will be found to be of that real advantage and security to the Church which its promoters contemplate and expect.

The second reason, then,—and it may prove in the

end to be the *one* great and all-sufficient reason,—for establishing, without further loss of time, a Church Education Fund, is this: that the Church may have it in her power to provide a system of Diocesan Inspection; an Inspection which shall, *in all respects*, be in a position to meet and counteract the great evils of the Government system. For the mere purposes of ascertaining the efficiency and general condition of the Church Schools in any diocese, the existing means of Diocesan Inspection, where any such are in operation, are, doubtless, amply sufficient, and very valuable; but it must be obvious that this is only a very small part of what has to be cared for, and guarded against, by the Church.

For, however satisfactory may be the issue of the controversy now pending in respect of the Management Clauses, it has become very apparent that the Queen's scholar, the pupil teacher, and stipendary monitor system, the certificate of merit system, the supply of cheap books, without a sufficient guarantee for their character, and the various other ways in which the influence of the Committee of Council is winding its ways into Church Schools, and bidding fair to transmute them, at no distant day, into State Schools, while, *nominally*, they are the Schools of the Church of England,—that these results of the operation of the Minutes of 1846, are, in the judgment of great numbers of Churchmen, full of the gravest cause for alarm.

It is now very commonly argued, and as it seems to me with great force, that, even if the Commit-

tee of Council were to abandon altogether their claim in respect of the Management Clauses, they would still be in a position to exercise a very commanding influence over Church Schools through the means of the annual grants, subjected, as these grants are in all cases, to the Report of the Government Inspector, and the ultimate decision of the Committee of Council. And I believe, that "my Lords" are so well aware of the vantage ground they occupy here, that, as a matter of fact, there is no part of the entire system which occupies so much of the attention of the Council Office—which makes so large demands upon the time and the energies of the Inspectors of Schools, or which, as might be expected from these efforts, and the very plausible and popular character of the system itself, is making such rapid advance throughout England.

It is now indeed by no means an uncommon belief among Churchmen that it has been part of the policy of the Committee of Council to provoke all this struggle about the Management Clauses, with this especial view—that, under cover of that struggle, they may the more easily attain their great object of securing, *by means of the Annual Grants*, that hold over Church Schools which may enable them by degrees to mould these Schools into a shape fitted for the purposes of the "comprehensive system"—that the Management Clauses, in a word, have been a *feint*, to divert attention from *the real assault*.

However, this may be—and undoubtedly, the course of the Committee of Council has been such as to justify any amount of suspicion—what I maintain

is this,—that, if the Management Clauses, however modified, are allowed to become the rule for the constitution and administration of Church Schools, the facilities for the easy and effectual establishment of the influence of the Committee of Council—and therefore, ultimately, of the State system—in the Schools of the Church of England will be *increased* an hundred-fold.

I have, indeed, heard it said that there is greater cause for alarm in the effects and tendencies of the system of annual grants, than in the Management Clauses themselves. It seems to me, however, that those who hold this language, overlook the fact that these Clauses are the foundation upon which it has been proposed to rear the fabric of State control; and that, wheresoever a Church School has been constituted according to the rule of the Clauses, there will be much more room, and much more ample facilities for the easy introduction of State novelties, and of all the devices and crotchets of a spurious liberality, than there can be where such a constitution and administration of the School has no place. There are very obvious reasons why a Managing Committee, however constituted, should present much fewer and less formidable obstacles in the way of what is called “the Comprehensive System,” than the Clergyman of the parish, and the Bishop of the diocese; and, among them, is one which ought, of itself, to supply a sufficient warning: what I mean is, that a Managing Committee can hardly be expected to be so alive to the paramount necessity of keeping a most jealous watch over the dogmatic

teaching of the Church as the parish Clergyman and his Bishop. I suppose, indeed, that there is very little doubt in men's minds now, that the calculation, and strong presumption that this would prove to be the case, is the key to the, otherwise inexplicable, obstinacy of the Committee of Council in seeking to force the Clauses upon Church founders.

The comparison between the various sources of danger to Church Education, so far as they can be distinguished from each other,—which is not very easy, for they are all the product of the same systematic attempt,—has led me to revert again to the Management Clauses. I will not further pursue the comparison: whatever the relative amount of danger may be, one thing is clear, that Churchmen are on all sides aghast at the prospect of mischief which the various shapes of annual assistance, in connexion with the Government Inspection, appear to be fast entailing upon Church Schools. With their eyes now wide open to the danger, Churchmen stand hopeless, because it has come upon them in the garb of a gift and an advantage, and because, though the mischief *is* certain, and *will be* great and overwhelming, it is not so much present as in prospect. It is, however, already bearing fruit, and that fruit is ripening fast: less than three years have already done more than could have been thought possible; three years more, at the same rate of progress, and it may, perhaps, not be very easy to find a School in connexion with the Committee of Council, which shall be based and conducted upon the principle of a close and

strict adherence to the dogmatic teaching, and the Apostolic discipline, of the Church of England. Now, if these words had been written *two* years ago,—and I did write some words very like them two years ago,—the great majority of those under whose eyes they might have come would have regarded them, probably, as simply ridiculous; and there will be those who will think them to be so now; but I believe there will be very many who will allow that these words have, at least, great ground to go upon, and not a few who will agree that, in all probability, they do not overstate the truth. Those, however, who come forward, at any time, with the avowed object of exposing a hidden danger, and of awakening suspicion and distrust of what wears the very popular and plausible appearance of being devised for the general good, must be content to be regarded in the outset as visionary alarmists, if not as interested mischief-makers. It is not often that their prognostications are so speedily verified, and promise to receive such complete and ample confirmation as in the present case.

I can see no remedy, then, for all these exceeding mischiefs, present and to come, but in the prompt and efficient establishment of a CHURCH EDUCATION FUND, internal to the Church, and removed from all contact with the State—a fund which shall supply the means of offering to Church Schools the same advantages with those offered by the Committee of Council, *but without the same dangers*. And if there be a necessity for it *now*, it cannot surely be doubted

that every succeeding year will make that necessity more pressing and more apparent. I cannot think that there is *any* safety for Church teaching and Church discipline, so long as a system of rewards and encouragement to Church children is, as has been practically the case since 1846-7, exclusively in the hands of the Committee of Council. And I would suggest, very respectfully, that it would be far better *to do without* the rewards and the encouragement, than to compromise our position by accepting them. But, as it is very certain that from some source they *must be had*, so, the ultimate, and only efficient, security lies, as it appears to me, in the establishment of the Church Education Fund. It is not to be concealed that, as it will be a new, so will it be a heavy charge upon the means of Churchmen; but surely there is no object of Christian alms-giving which carries with it a greater claim.

I have indeed no fear, that, when the Church of England is once fairly thrown upon her own resources, and taught that she must depend, under God, upon these, and not upon the State, for the support of Church Education, there will be any want of means for the efficient establishment of a Church Education Fund. I believe myself that *much more money* will be forthcoming *then* than is forthcoming *now*. Men give more largely, with a readier heart, and a more open hand, when they are *sure* that what is given will go in support of the principles which they are, as members of the Church Catholic, pledged

to uphold, and neither in whole, nor in part, in support of any thing else.

If, however, we want any encouragement from experience, to move us to make a *combined* effort to establish a Church Education Fund, that encouragement is to be found at once in the success which has attended *individual* efforts to collect money for the purposes of an Education which shall carry with it, in all respects, a distinct and complete Church character. If, on the other hand, we have need to be roused by the fear of consequences, we must know that, in the same proportion that we fail, or, perhaps, in even a greater proportion, our opponents will derive strength from our weakness.

I am most unwilling to give offence, but I cannot refrain from saying here, that if the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England will not raise among themselves year by year—for the sake of saving Church Education from being destroyed—such a sum as is offered now, or may be offered hereafter, by the Committee of Council, it will not simply be that Church Education will be destroyed before our eyes, but that we shall *deserve* that it be destroyed before our eyes.

Upon every ground, therefore, I commit this appeal, with hope and confidence, into the hands of the sons and daughters of the Church of England. He, in Whose cause, as I humbly trust, the appeal is made, will prosper it according to His Own good pleasure.

If we are really and effectually to plant the Church of Christ in other lands, we must keep safe the treasures of that Church at home. There is, and there can be, no safety for these, unless Church Education is preserved pure from all admixture with the State element. The Parish School of the English Parish is the nursery of Catholic truth and Apostolic discipline. Woe be to us, and to our children, if we do not defend it with heart and hand !

I beg leave to state here, that I shall be very glad to receive the names of Churchmen, whether members or subscribers to the National Society or not, who concur in the above proposition for the establishment of a Church Education Fund, and are willing to contribute towards it, with a view to the consideration of the details of the plan, and with the further view of making a respectful request to his Grace the President, and the Committee of the National Society, that they will consent to take charge of the Fund and of the administration of it.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

A.

ANNUAL MEETING OF SECRETARIES.

THE Annual Meeting of the Secretaries of Diocesan and Local Boards and District Societies in union with the Society, was held in the Central Schoolroom, Westminster, on Tuesday, the 5th of June.

The following Resolutions, moved by the Rev. Sir Henry Thompson, Bart., were, after a long discussion, unanimously agreed to on the subject of Diocesan Inspection :—

“ 1. That in the opinion of this meeting it is expedient that all Schools connected with the Church should be periodically inspected, with the concurrence of the Clergy and other managers, by Inspectors appointed by the Bishop of each diocese.

“ 2. That such Inspection is not to be considered as interfering with, or in lieu of, the Inspectors appointed by the Committee of Council on Education.

“ 3. That with a view to facilitate the general introduction of Diocesan Inspection, and to promote uniformity of method in carrying it out, the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested, with the concurrence of the Most Rev. the Archbishop of York and the Right Rev. the Bishops of both provinces, to prepare forms of queries and returns, which may be furnished by the National Society to all Bishops favourable to the adoption of a plan of Diocesan Inspection, and inclined to receive them.”

The subject of the effect of the Minutes of the Committee of Council of August and December, 1846, relating to the certificates of teachers, and the apprenticeship of pupil teachers, was considered; and the Rev. B. Spencer Drummond laid before the meeting a paper containing an account of the success and practicability of self-supporting Schools. After which the meeting broke up, having lasted four hours.

B.

*Correspondence with the Committee of Council on Education,
March, 1849.*

(Copy.)

East Brent, Cross, Somerset,
March 16th, 1849.

SIR,—I observe, that in the volume containing the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education for 1839-40, it is stated, under the head of “Extract from the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education 15th July, 1840,” p. 21,—

“That each Inspector, at the same time that he presents any Report relating to the said Schools (*i. e.* Schools in connexion with the Church of England) to the Committee of Privy Council, shall transmit a duplicate thereof to the Archbishop, and shall also send a copy to the Bishop of the Diocese in which the School is situate, for his information.”

In the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, which is based upon the Minute of July 15th, 1840, it is stated, pp. ix. x.—

“We are further of opinion, that each of the said Inspectors, at the same time that he presents any Report relating to such Schools (*i. e.* Schools in connexion with the National Society, or with the Church of England) to the Committee of Privy Council, should be directed to transmit a duplicate thereof to the Archbishop of the province, and should also send a copy to the Bishop of the Diocese in which the School is situate, for his information.”

Under the second head of “Instructions to Inspectors of

Schools," issued from the Council Office August ¹, 1840, and signed "James Phillips Kay," it is stated further, in referring to the reports to be made by the Inspectors,—

"In obedience to Her Majesty's Order in Council, dated August 10th, 1840, a duplicate of such Reports respecting Schools connected with the Established Church, is to be forwarded by the Inspector to the Archbishop, and a copy to the Bishop of the Diocese in which the School is situate, for his information."—p. 25.

But the concluding paragraph of these same "Instructions" runs as follows:—

"And in every particular case the Inspector will draw up a Report, and transmit a duplicate of it, through the Committee of Council on Education, to the Archbishop of the province."—p. 32.

I beg to ask whether the Government Inspectors act in conformity with the above extract from the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, or in conformity with the last paragraph of the "Instructions," because the difference between the two is very marked and significant, both in respect of the manner of transmitting the duplicate of the Report, and of the parties to whom it is to be transmitted.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient Servant,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education.

Committee of Council on Education,

Privy Council Office, Downing Street,

21st March, 1849.

REV. SIR,—The Lord President of the Council has given his attention to the difference which you have pointed out, in the wording of a paragraph which occurs in the following documents, viz., the Minute of the 15th of July, 1840; the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840; and the second head of the Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors, dated August, 1840, as

¹ No day specified in the original.

compared with the concluding sentence of the third division of the Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors, dated August, 1840.

The first of these paragraphs is in substance the same as that which occurs in the Minute of July 15th, 1840, viz. :—

“ That each Inspector, at the same time that he presents any Report relating to the said Schools to the Committee of the Privy Council, shall transmit a duplicate thereof to the Archbishop, and shall also send a copy to the Bishop of the Diocese in which the School is situate, for his information.”

The second paragraph is as follows :—

“ And in every particular case, the Inspector will draw up a Report, and transmit a duplicate of it, through the Committee of Council on Education, to the Archbishop of the province.”

The latter of these two paragraphs is extracted from that part of the Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors (printed in *Italics*), which was framed by the Archbishops, and appended to these Instructions, in pursuance of the following passage in the Order in Council of the 10th of August, 1840 :—

“ We further beg leave humbly to recommend to your Majesty to direct, that such portions of the Instructions to these Inspectors as relate to religious teaching, shall be framed by the Archbishops, and form part of the general Instructions issued by us to the Inspectors of such Schools.”

The Lord President ascertained from the late Primate, that it was his Grace's wish and pleasure that the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors should be communicated through the Committee of Council on Education to the Archbishops and Bishops.

The Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Church of England Schools have accordingly been transmitted to the Archbishops and Bishops, through the Committee of Council on Education.

I have the honour to be,

Reverend Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

J. P. KAY SHUTTLEWORTH.

Rev. G. A. Denison,

East Brent, Somerset.

(Copy.)

East Brent, Cross, Somerset,

March 23rd, 1849.

SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 21st instant.

I regret to be obliged to say, that the answer which it gives to my inquiry appears to me to be very far from sufficient or satisfactory.

I found in the volume of the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1839-40, certain "Instructions to Inspectors," issued from the Council Office, August, 1840, which indicated a departure from the letter and the intention of the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, in respect both of the method of transmitting the duplicates of the Inspectors' Reports, and of the quarters in which those Reports are transmitted.

It appeared to me that this departure involved considerations of the greatest importance, and such as cannot fail to present themselves in this light to the minds of members of the Church of England, so soon as their attention is called to the fact of such departure having taken place.

I therefore addressed to you my letter of 16th instant, with a request for an explanation.

In reply I am told,

1st.—That the paragraph indicating the departure is extracted from that part of the "Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors" which was framed by the Archbishops.

2nd.—That "the Lord President ascertained from the late Primate, that it was his Grace's will and pleasure that the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools should be communicated through the Committee of Council on Education to the Archbishops and Bishops."

I would observe on these two statements taken in connexion,

1st.—That the paragraph in question speaks only of the Archbishop of the province, omitting all mention of the Bishops.

2nd.—That the members of the Church of England can

hardly be asked to accept a departure from the letter and intention of the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, upon the simple statement that "the Lord President ascertained from the late Primate, &c.:"—every one will, I believe, be ready to allow, that in such a case documentary evidence may most properly and reasonably be required to be produced; and that both the fact of the departure, and the reasons for it, should be distinctly stated.

But, 3rd.—I would submit that, supposing that such documentary evidence can be produced, the matter is one in which there is no room for any such departure at all.

The members of the Church of England accepted the Order in Council as the settlement of a question pending between the Church and the State, and, upon the faith of that settlement, proceeded to submit their Schools to Government Inspection, in the full belief and assurance that the Order in Council would be, literally and strictly, adhered to.

I am told further—in respect of the actual practice of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Church of England Schools, that "the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Church of England Schools have, accordingly, been transmitted to the Archbishops and Bishops through the Committee of Council on Education."

The time of transmitting the Reports, and the shape in which they are transmitted, are not stated; on the other hand, the Order in Council is express upon both points.

"Each Inspector *at the same time* that he presents *any* Report relating to the said Schools to the Committee of Privy Council shall transmit *a duplicate thereof* to the Archbishop, and shall also send *a copy* to the Bishop of the diocese in which the School is situate, for his information."

On the whole then it appears,—

That for some cause, of which there is as yet no sufficient or

satisfactory account, the letter and the intention of the Order in Council have been very widely departed from in the matter of the Inspectors' Reports.

It would be with very great regret that I should see the School of this parish deprived of the visits of Her Majesty's Inspector—and I will still hope that any such necessity may be avoided ; but I am bound to state that, as matters now stand, I must decline to admit such Inspector any longer into the School on the specific ground of this departure from the letter and the intention of the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The Secretary of the

Committee of Council on Education.

Committee of Council on Education,

Council Office, Whitehall,

March 28th, 1849.

REV. SIR,—I am directed by the Lord President, in reply to the remarks which you have made on the mode in which the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors are transmitted to the Prelates, to call your attention to the fact, that the difference between the two paragraphs, quoted in my last letter, consists essentially in this,—that whereas the first does not define whether those Reports shall be transmitted mediately, or immediately to the Prelates ; the second, which proceeds from the authority of the Archbishops, declares that they shall be sent through the medium of the Committee of Council on Education.

Even without this authoritative declaration from the Archbishops, the practice of transmitting these Reports through the Committee of Council on Education is not a departure from the provisions of the Order in Council ; and, with this express declaration of the Archbishops before them, my Lords have never conceived that the provisions of the Order in Council required any other interpretation, than that Her Majesty's Inspectors were

to transmit their Reports to the Prelates, according to the ordinary practice in public departments.

That this has always been their Lordships' view is shown by the fact, that the Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors, dated August, 1840, contain both the paragraph in similar words to those of the Order in Council, and the paragraph written by the Archbishops, directing that the Inspectors' Reports shall be transmitted to the Prelates through the Committee of Council on Education.

Even were the reasons which you assign for refusing the Inspection of your School of greater general weight, they would not justify an interference with what must be considered as a pure legal right. The inspection of the East Brent School is secured in the conveyance of the site of that School, from the late Vicar, in the following words:—"And to permit such School-room or Schoolrooms to be opened at all reasonable times to the Inspection of the Inspectors appointed, or to be appointed in pursuance of Her Majesty's Order in Council, bearing date the 10th day of August, 1840." A person so appointed has a complete legal right to inspect the School, which cannot be defeated by any course of practice on the part of that Inspector (as to Reports, or the transmission of his Reports), which may be assumed to be, or may in fact be, a departure from the Instructions proposed by the Order in Council.

But you are probably aware, that Her Majesty's Inspectors are at present very fully occupied with the Inspection of Schools, which partake of the benefits of the Minutes of 1846, by the apprenticeship of Pupil Teachers, or the augmentation of the Stipends of Teachers who have obtained Certificates of Merit, neither of which classes of grants have you thought it expedient to obtain from the Committee of Council for the East Brent School.

My Lords may not therefore find it possible (without a further increase in the Staff of Her Majesty's Inspectors) to provide for the immediate Inspection of your School; and it has always been their Lordships' disposition to depend on the sense of the great advantages consequent on Inspection, for its cordial reception,

rather than to obtain, by force of law, a right to inspect a School when those advantages were not confessed, or were rejected.

Nevertheless, should circumstances arise to render the legal enforcement of the right of Inspection desirable, my Lords will not fail to adopt proper measures.

The Lord President directs me to state, that, though nearly nine years have now elapsed since the date of the Order in Council, and of the Instructions referred to by you, their Lordships have had no reason whatever to suppose, that the practice which the Committee of Council have invariably pursued as to the mode of transmitting the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors, sanctioned as it was by the declaration of the Archbishops, has been in any respect unsatisfactory to the heads of the Church. Though, therefore, I have been permitted to reply to your inquiries, I am to remind you, that your remarks would be more properly addressed to the Archbishops. My Lords will at all times be ready to confer with the Archbishops on any matter relative to the interpretation of their Lordships' Minutes. It is peculiarly fitting that they should do so, if their Graces ever entertain any doubt whether communications to the Prelates have been made at the proper time, and in the proper form; nor would my Lords have any apprehension of a difference of opinion in a matter in which they were careful to ascertain the views of the Archbishops.

The Lord President is, however, unwilling to permit this correspondence to proceed any further.

I have the honour to be,

Reverend Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

J. P. KAY SHUTTLEWORTH.

*The Rev. George Anthony Denison,
East Brent.*

(Copy.)

East Brent, Cross, Somerset,
March 31st, 1849.

SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 28th instant.

My reply to that letter shall be as brief as possible ; it would have been briefer still had not the letter gone out of its way to imply that I am to blame in not having procured for the East Brent School assistance under the Minutes of 1846.

This makes it necessary for me to remind you that I was one of the earliest applicants for assistance under those Minutes ; but that I was compelled to withdraw that application, and to decline to establish any further connexion between the School of this place and the Committee of Council on Education, because I saw great reason to apprehend that a very undue prominence would be given, under the operation of those Minutes, to mere attainment, and that such further connexion with the Committee of Council would be to the injury and disparagement of the dogmatic teaching and the discipline of the Church of England.

I look back now upon that withdrawal of my application with the utmost thankfulness : all the experience of the last two years has gone to show that my apprehensions were well founded. Your own letter, indeed, to Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, dated March 12th, 1849, and published in the Guardian of 28th inst., and especially the last paragraph of that letter, supplies, of itself, very sufficient evidence of what is the actual operation of the Minutes of 1846 in respect of the undue exaltation of mere attainment, and a case exactly in point has very recently occurred in this Diocese.

With regard to your statement, that “ a person so appointed (*i. e.* appointed in pursuance of the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840), has a complete legal right to inspect the School, which cannot be defeated by any course of proceeding on the part of the Inspector (as to Reports, or the transmission of Reports) which may be assumed to be, or may in fact be, a departure from the Instructions proposed by the Order in Council,” I can hardly

suppose that such a proposition is meant to be maintained seriously. I need not, however, make any further comment upon it; it will be sufficiently understood and appreciated by Churchmen as it stands.

When the Archbishop of the Province, *and the Bishop of the Diocese*, shall see fit to signify, under their hands, their desire that the letter and the intention of the Order in Council of August 10, 1840 (upon the faith of the exact observance of which Order in Council in all respects, the Schools of the Church of England come under an obligation to admit Her Majesty's Inspector), shall be departed from in regard to the transmission of the Inspectors' Reports, I shall *then* be prepared to readmit Her Majesty's Inspector into the East Brent School, and shall be very glad to see him there again.

But no consideration, nor any *threats* of legal consequences, will move me to admit such Inspector any longer into the School *as the case stands now*.

I have only to add that it is my intention to publish this correspondence.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

*The Secretary of the Committee of Council
on Education.*

REMARKS.

- 1.—It is not easy to understand that it could have been the intention of the late Primate to sanction a departure from the Order in Council of August 10, 1840, in any matter connected with the Inspection.

In the Report of His Grace's Speech in Parliament we find the following—Hansard, 3rd Series, vol. lv. col. 754. :—

“The chief difficulty related to the appointment of Inspectors; and that difficulty, he was happy to say, had

been overcome. *Should the arrangements which have been made be fully and fairly carried into effect*, which he believed would be the case, he had no doubt, judging from the nature of the discussions and negotiations which had taken place in reference to them, that they would be found to operate very beneficially."

- 2.—That the letter of the Secretary of the Committee of Council, dated March 28, states that the paragraph following,—

"That each Inspector, at the same time that he presents any Report relating to the said Schools to the Committee of the Privy Council, shall transmit a duplicate thereof to the Archbishop, and shall also send a copy to the Bishop of the diocese, in which the School is situate, for his information,"

—does not define whether those Reports shall be transmitted *mediately* or *immediately* to the Prelates.

I submit that the words "*at the same time*" and the word "*duplicate*" most clearly define that the Reports were intended to be transmitted, not *mediately*, but *immediately*, both to the Archbishop of the Province and to the Bishop of the diocese.

The *main* points however are these :—

- 1.—That, by transmitting the Reports *through the Committee of Council*, the Archbishops are not dealt with as the Order in Council of August 10, 1840, provided that their Graces should be—*i. e.* as *concurrent* authorities in the matter of Inspection.
- 2.—That, by transmitting the Reports through the Committee of Council, the Managers of Church Schools are deprived of that security for the character and contents of the Reports which it was the intention of the Order in Council to give them.

The result of the above Correspondence renders it necessary to make an addition to division 2, of Resolution 1, to be moved at the ensuing Annual Meeting of the National Society.

It will therefore run as under :—

“ Provided always that such Inspection shall not exceed, or in any respect depart from, to the prejudice of the Church, the precise terms and limits of the letter, and of the spirit of the agreement of 1840.”

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

East Brent,

April 10th, 1849.

(*To the Editor of the English Churchman.*)

MY DEAR SIR,—Will you have the goodness to publish the following correspondence ?

Very faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

East Brent, Cross, Somerset,

May 28th, 1849.

I.

Prees Salop, 14th April, 1849.

REV. SIR,—I have seen, in the *Morning Chronicle* of yesterday's date, a copy of some letters that have passed between yourself and the Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education, and I think it right to furnish you the following information :—

When engaged in drawing up the Report printed in the second volume of the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education for 1844 (p. 47), I felt the difficulty of having so large a mass of statistics transcribed for MS. circulation ; and, without any communication with my Lords of the Committee of Council on Education, I applied to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Bishops over those dioceses in which I had acted as Inspector, to know if it would be satisfactory to their lordships if my Report should be put up in type, and the proof sheets be transmitted to their lordships at the same time that they were transmitted to the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education ; it being understood that this did not preclude me from finally revising my Report before it was laid before Parliament.

I subjoin a copy of the replies sent to my application, and I forward the originals for your inspection, requesting that those originals may be returned to me.

“ Addington, January 27th, 1845.

“ MY DEAR SIR,—I intended fully to have answered your note on Saturday. The Archbishop seems to think that the terms of the agreement to which you refer would be fully satisfied if the Reports of Inspection reach his hands and those of the other Archbishops and Bishops in the same form, and at the same time, as they reach the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education.

“ I remain, my dear Sir,

“ Yours very faithfully,

(Signed) “ BENJAMIN HARRISON.”

“ *Rev. J. Allen.*”

What follows next is only an extract.

“ London House, 27th January, 1845.

“ MY DEAR ALLEN,—I am very sorry that I was unable to write to you on Saturday. The Bishop will be quite willing to accede to the arrangement you mention about the Report, and to receive it at the same time, and in the same shape, as it reaches Lord Wharncliffe.

(Signed) “ CHAS. B. DALTON.”

“ *The Rev. John Allen.*”

“ Farnham Castle, January 24th, 1845.

“ MY DEAR SIR,—As far as I am concerned, I make no objection whatever to the course you propose to pursue with respect to the Report.

“ Your very faithful Servant,

(Signed) “ C. WINTON.”

“ *Rev. John Allen.*”

I have only to add that I have received no intimation of your correspondence except from the newspapers. I forward a copy

of this to the P. C. office, thinking it right that it should be printed.

Rev. Sir, I am your faithful servant,

JOHN ALLEN,

Archdeacon of Salop, Dio. of Lich.,
late one of H. M. Inspec. of Schools.

Rev. G. A. Denison,

East Brent, Cross, Somerset.

II.

East Brent, Cross, Somerset, April 16th, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,—I found your letter and its enclosures on my return this evening from Bristol. I beg to thank you very kindly for having communicated with me upon this subject, and to return the enclosures.

The letter of Archdeacon Harrison, on the part of the Archbishop, proves very distinctly that when Mr. Kay Shuttleworth states that “the Lord President ascertained from the late Primate that it was his Grace’s will and pleasure that the Reports of Her Majesty’s Inspectors should be communicated *through the Committee of Council on Education* to the Archbishops and Bishops,” he states what is altogether incorrect.

There is obviously a great deal in the matter which calls for further explanation; that such a sentence as that which concludes the Instructions printed in italics should have come from the Archbishop in August, 1840, would have been scarcely credible, even without the evidence to the contrary which is supplied by the letters you have enclosed.

I enclose a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of the Committee of Council and myself, as it was sent to the newspapers.

I am, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The Ven. Archdeacon Allen.

III.

East Brent, Cross, Somerset, May 16th, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,—I hardly know whether I put the right interpretation upon the last sentence of your letter to me, dated April 14th,—

“ I forward a copy of this letter to the P. C. office, thinking it right that it should be printed.”

I gathered from this that you proposed to publish the letters of which you were so good as to send me copies, with some account of the circumstances under which they were addressed to you ; and, as these letters appeared to me to supply the strongest possible proof of what I had suspected to be the truth, I have been looking very anxiously for such publication.

Perhaps, however, your meaning was that I should make such use of the communication as I judged best ; but I should be very sorry to take any step of this kind without having previously communicated with you, and having received from you an acknowledgment that you were aware of my purpose to do so.

Very faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The Ven. Archdeacon Allen.

IV.

Prees, Salop,

May 18th, 1849.

DEAR SIR,—I am obliged by your note. I still think it right that my letter to you should be printed; and you will, in printing it, as I hope, render no dis-service to the cause I ought to have much at heart, namely, the harmonious co-operation of the Ministers of our Church with the Government in its efforts to improve the education of our poor.

I am, dear Sir, your faithful Servant,

JOHN ALLEN.

P.S. In printing our correspondence I take it for granted that you will print the whole.

Rev. G. A. Denison.

V.

East Brent, Cross, Somerset,
Sunday after Ascension, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge and to thank you for your letter of the 18th instant, and to say that I now propose to send the whole correspondence to the newspapers.

I think with you that that man must be very unwise and very wrong-minded who does not earnestly desire, and who would not do all that he may do, to secure “the harmonious co-operation of the Ministers of our Church with the Government in its efforts to improve the education of our poor.”

It is, therefore, with very great concern that I find myself altogether unable to understand how such harmonious co-operation can be, in any manner, possible, so long as the proceedings of the Committee of Council on Education are marked by the gravest injustice towards the Church of England, and by the endeavour to make the whole administration of the education grant subserve the gradual introduction into Church Schools of the “comprehensive” system, as a step towards the ultimate introduction of the State, or combined, system.

I will send copies of the correspondence, when printed, to the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Archdeacon Harrison, and Mr. Dalton. Will you kindly inform them that you have placed their letters in my hands for publication?

I am, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,
GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The Ven. Archdeacon Allen.

THE END.









